

the Church, in doing so consent to the order of government established therein.

By the order thus given it is not a doctrine that a majority of members rules the Church, when it comes to government thereof. If such a doctrine were maintained, then in such cases as majorities are wrong—and these are numerous in the world's history—the government would be wrong. But whether right or wrong, if a majority among mortals were to control in government then the organization would be subject to mortal destiny. The Church is ruled or governed from its Head, not its body or limbs, and that Head is Christ. There is a regularly constituted set of officers, each quorum in its place, directed and controlled by rules received from the divine Head. Hence man is not the master or ruler of the Church, but its director and controller is the One whose Church it is.

Herein is the free agency of man and the power of God preserved in perfect harmony. By acquiring membership in the Church in accord with its principles, which requires intelligent action on the part of the individual in subscribing to the doctrines of faith, repentance, remission of sin and the guidance of the Holy Spirit, those who do so consent to established rules in the Church; and if there are other rules required by change in circumstances, these are submitted in regular form. At the same time the power of salvation is in the grace of the Almighty, and is made effectual to the believer by his obedience to divine law to which he gives assent. The member obeys principles, consents to rules of procedure; and in the Church government the inviolable law is that God rules in His Church.

ONE DAY FOR "OLD GLORY."

The committee on Fourth of July celebration in San Francisco has decided that no national flag but that of the United States shall be carried in the procession on the celebration of the next Fourth in that city. This decision has aroused the ire of the Rev. P. C. Yorke, a Catholic priest. Mr. Yorke is one of those of his faith who has been most outspoken in denouncing the anti-Catholic procedure of the A. P. A. In doing so he has laid great stress on the loyalty of Catholics to the Stars and Stripes. Being a good and vigorous speaker, he has acquired considerable fame and support in his opposition to anti-religious bigotry.

But in this later business the Catholic priest seems to have gone too far. In an impassioned discourse before the League of the Cross cadets on Friday evening he gave a terrible "scorching" to those who took the stand that on the nation's birthday anniversary "Old Glory" should be given the post of honor and all other national flags be laid away for that day, so far as its celebration was concerned. The priest argued that "when we want to be truly patriotic we must remember that there are other flags that have stood for the principles of liberty," and that this is "a composite nation—made up of many nations." Then he pointed out how Lafayette, Steuben

and other foreigners aided in gaining American independence.

None will dispute the value of aid received in the war of the Revolution from Frenchmen, Germans and others, or that it was a composite people struggling for liberty. But it was not "a composite nation" that won the struggle—not by any means. It was one nation—the United States of America; and there was one flag—the Stars and Stripes—that represented the triumph. Other flags have stood for causes good and true in other lands, but in this Republic "Old Glory" is the banner that covers the entire field of the battle for political freedom. If there is any day on which the flags of all other nations should be ready to keep in the rear in this country it is on our national Independence Day, when the Stars and Stripes is big and bright enough to cover the whole display. If citizens in their magnanimity or for particular purposes desire to permit in processions on that day the flags of any or all nations, they have a perfect right to do so, and it is commonly a nice thing to do when people want it; but if they decide to do otherwise they also have the right, and it is in bad taste for the advocates of any or all foreign flags to create a disturbance about it. Especially does it come with bad grace from a preacher who has boasted long and loud of the special claims his co-religionists have to patriotism and loyalty, to raise "a roar" because the national flag is given exclusive precedence over others on the nation's chief holiday. He ought to be patriotic enough to submit gracefully to a proposition of that kind when agreed upon by a majority of those who represented the people in deciding such a matter. The angry and special advocacy of claims of foreign nations or foreign flags as being entitled to the credit for or as typical of the liberties this country enjoys, is not the most loyal kind of procedure for Independence Day celebrations.

THE "BOLTING" PROSPECT.

Since the bolt of some of the silver Republicans from the St. Louis convention there has been displayed a marked tendency to a vigorous "bolting" procedure in political matters generally. Following the walking out of the convention delegates referred to, several leading Republicans in different states also have walked out of their party on the financial issue; and the probability is that if the convention "bolt" had occurred with the sentiment of a week later it would have been of considerably larger dimensions than it was. From now on, however, in the Republican party, it will be the action of individuals or sections, and there will be no opportunity for a great display of the faction until the effect of the "bolting" votes is told in November next.

While the Republican political organization has had its public diversion in this line, there are other party conventions which will have opportunity to make a showing. From present indications it is not at all improbable that the "bolt" in the Populist organization

will be only a few who will not follow the lead of a silver-Republican candidate such as Senator Teller; for almost the whole Populist vote probably will go to him with a "snap," since in his candidacy is the chief hope that party has of establishing one of its pillars—free silver—in high places. Still there are some Populists who will insist on not going outside of their own party for a presidential or other nominee.

But the chief "bolting" prospect now is with the Democratic party, whose national convention meets in Chicago within a fortnight. Whether or not any of the delegates to that body will leave it is an open question, about which there is much less certainty than there was three weeks ago of Colorado's withdrawal at St. Louis. Some of the "sound money" Democrats who are seeking to prevent the adoption of a free coinage of silver policy are emphatically in favor of leaving the convention if they are outvoted. Others insist that the proper rule is that if delegates go to the convention without explicit instructions from their constituents they are in duty bound to remain in the convention and to do their "withdrawing" afterwards, as individuals and not as delegates; and this view, being more in accord than the other with the ordinary courtesies of such an event, at present seems to be gaining in favor, and to promise that there may not be a "bolt" of great dimensions during the Chicago convention, but that following it there will be a wholesale refusal to abide by the platform. Thus, in the event of either policy in convention, there is going to be just as big a "bolt" to Democratic as in Republican ranks.

The vigorous tone of "sound money" Democratic papers since the St. Louis episode leaves no doubt as to the determination of that wing of the party to break away if a silver candidate is nominated on a silver platform. Even those journals that are most emphatic in denouncing the walking out of delegates from a convention are almost united in the view expressed by the Brooklyn Eagle, which declares that a revolt in convention would not be justified by any kind of money plank, but after the convention is over those dissatisfied thereby "should not aspire to take part in party management, but hold to the station of an independent individual voter, whose right to 'bolt,' 'scratch,' or 'sulk' in his tent is not to be gainsaid."

Still beyond the mere disagreement as to party policy is the appeal that is being made, as it was made in 1880, to the patriotism of the people. The cry is that "sound money" advocates in all parties, and all who are inspired with love for the Union, should "unite against the common foe of silverites, Populists, and demagogues, whose rule means ruin." "Save the country from these enemies first!" exclaims the New York Herald, "and then it will be time to think of party ties." This call on patriotism will not be without effect, especially on voters who are honest enough, but who are not particularly thoughtful and between whom, because of lack of thoughtfulness, and unconditional caste the chief difference is in the number of legs. With such a class,